

REMARKS

Claims 7-12 and 27-31 have been examined and are rejected. Specifically, claims 7-12 and 27-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,841 to Schumacher et al. (hereinafter “Schumacher”), in view of newly applied U.S. Patent No. 6,286,017 to Egilsson (hereinafter “Egilsson”).

As an initial matter, claim 7 is amended to recite the operation of “dynamically generating a page of presentation material in response to a request for said first information, wherein the page is generated based on the first presentation layout and includes said first information and does not contain said second information,” thereby further clarifying that the page of presentation material is dynamically generated. Claims 11 and 27, which are the other independent claims, are amended in a similar fashion. These amendments are not intended to narrow the scope of the original claims, but are rather for precision of language and to explicitly recite within the claim what was believed to have already been implicitly defined therein. Accordingly, these amendments are not believed to foreclose application of reasonable equivalents.

It is respectfully submitted that Schumacher fails to disclose the dynamic generation of a page of presentation material. To the contrary, Schumacher discloses using a browser 80 to simplify the retrieval of information by allowing access to a pre-defined section of a document by pushing a button (Schumacher: Abstract; and col. 10, lines 65-67). In Schumacher, the document itself is a static, pre-prepared document and is not generated dynamically

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/479,999
Attorney Docket No. A7631

(Schumacher: col. 4, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 14-16; and Figs. 2(A)-2(C)). Instead, the static document is merely retrieved, without any portion thereof being generated (Schumacher: col. 6, lines 37-44 and 49-56; and col. 9, lines 36-39).

Furthermore, the selective displaying of portions of the static document does not correspond to dynamically generating a page of presentation material. Since the document itself is static and its structure pre-defined (Schumacher: col. 4, lines 36-37; col. 6, lines 14-16; and Figs. 2(A)-2(C)), such that the portions of the document to be displayed are also static and pre-defined, there is no need to dynamically generate any pages of presentation material.

Thus, Schumacher does not disclose any dynamic generation of a page of presentation material. Likewise, Egilsson, which the Examiner relies on for allegedly disclosing defining a variable for each icon in a source code where the icons represent user selected variables within a program module specification (Office Action: page 3), does not make up for these deficiencies of Schumacher. Accordingly, claims 7, 11 and 27 are not rendered obvious by the proposed combination of Schumacher in view of Egilsson. Consequently, claims 8-10, 12 and 28-31 are patentable over the proposed combination of Schumacher and Egilsson, at least by virtue of their dependency.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 09/479,999
Attorney Docket No. A7631

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,



Kelly G. Hyndman

Reg. No. 39,234

William H. Mandir
Registration No. 32,156

Date: August 31, 2005